



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

4 *hågring*.—P. 24 “note to p. 15, 6” (read 15, 5); p. 33, 4 “line 5” (line 7); p. 35, 3 “note to p. 25, 5” (20, 5).—Other misprints are: p. 33, 4 “prefix” (suffix); p. 131, 5, sentence unfinished; p. 159, 4 *mörkets* (*mörkrets*).—In the text, p. 41 *hängda* should be *hängde*.

A. LOUIS ELMQUIST.

Northwestern University.

OLD FRENCH.

An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology, by FREDERICK BLISS LUQUIENS. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1909.

This book, as the author informs us in his preface, “is intended not only to introduce beginners to the study of Old French phonology and morphology from the historical point of view, but also to facilitate their progress to an advanced grammar.” As a model of such a larger work Professor Luquiens justly considers the well-known *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen* of Schwan-Behrens (7th ed., 1907),¹ and it is to this volume that he refers us as the basis of his *Introduction to Old French*. Let it be said at once, however, that while he has in the main closely adhered to his model both in the arrangement and the theoretical presentation of the matter—an indebtedness for which full acknowledgment is made,—he has by no means followed it slavishly. The independence of his scholarship and judgment is evinced both in the manner in which minor details have been either separated from the more essential matter, or entirely omitted, and in the changes and additions, especially of a pedagogical nature, which have been introduced. Among such changes and additions, the following devices deserve to be mentioned as distinctive and very useful features of his work: 1) An alphabetical list of Phonetic Symbols (pp. 17–19), which is both more complete and more explanatory than the ones offered in the grammars of Schwan-Behrens and others, and all the more helpful as phonetic transcription of words and sounds is more

systematically employed than in similar manuals; 2) three connected passages, with phonetic transcription and commentary, from the *Chanson de Roland*, the *Roman de la Rose*, and *Maistre Pierre Pathelin* (pp. 142–147); 3) a glossary of Technical Terms (pp. 20–22), and 4) a cross-section drawing of the Organs of Speech (p. 23). Such aids as these are unquestionably timely and may be welcomed as a most valuable innovation in the making of elementary historical grammars; but their very timeliness suggests the question whether they should not be accompanied by the explicit statement that a careful training in the classical languages, especially in Latin, in the elements of phonetics and in the correct pronunciation of at least one modern Romance language is the indispensable preparation for a successful study of Romance philology.

The Bibliography and the Alphabetical Index of the volume of Schwan-Behrens have been purposely omitted, the latter on the ground that it might prevent the student from making himself as thoroughly familiar with the elementary grammar as is desirable. Without in the least questioning the wisdom of this view for the purposes of the book before us, we hope that in a second edition the author may feel encouraged to enlarge its scope, adding to a more detailed treatment of the historical development of the language not only a bibliography and a historical index, but a chronological survey of phonetic changes such as the one offered by Meyer-Lübke in his *Historische Grammatik der Französischen Sprache* (Heidelberg, 1908), p. 261, and a list of the most important problems still awaiting solution.

Inasmuch as the phonological and morphological presentation of Old French in the work before us is substantially based upon that of Schwan-Behrens, it is not necessary to enter into anything like a full discussion of the various questions involved. Only a few remarks will be made here in the hope that they may prove of some service to the author in the preparation of a new edition of his grammar.

P. 14, § 10–11 we read: “When this change (*i. e.*, *c > ch*) is more closely examined, it appears: . . . (2) that it took place only during the first Old French period; *i. e.*, that any *c* which had not changed to *ch* by ca. 1100, did not do so

¹ A new, eighth edition (1909) has just appeared.

after that date." This statement does not appear quite correct in the light of what Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*, I, § 13; *Einführung*, § 31, has well said with regard to such forms as *chaste*, *chapitre*, *Venit. famega*, etc. Cf. also Suchier in *Miscellanea Ascoli*, p. 69.—P. 15, § 12. In his effort to condense the exposition of the relations between inherited and borrowed words, the author left out of account the fact that Vulgar Latin adopted literary forms which became part of the inherited property of Old French. Cf. e. g., Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, § 29.—P. 21. Metathesis results from rapidity of speech rather than from the tendency to ease pronunciation.—P. 27, § 21–28. The passage of VL. *x* before consonants to *s* should have been noted, and § 158, 2 modified accordingly.—P. 34, § 60, note. At least one illustration, e. g., *oc'lu* > *ol'u* > *ueil*, should have been given here.—P. 42, § 108. Read *cippum* for *cippum*; also, *ibid.*, § 113, VL. *p.* for OF. *p.*—P. 63, § 257. Instead of saying that *ai* becomes *ēi* during the twelfth century, it would be more exact to say that the two nasal diphthongs were identical in sound and employed in rhyme together since the middle of that century. Cf. Matzke, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, 21, 637 ff.—P. 70, § 286, 1. *Li rei gonfanoniers*, "the standard-bearer of the king." Westholm (*Étude historique de la construction li fils le rei*, 1899) has shown that in such possessive expressions the accusative-form *rei* performs the function of a dative rather than as a genitive, as it is still commonly assumed, and it is desirable that the student's attention be called to this fact.—P. 99, § 342. "The second *d* of the VL. ending *-dēdi* disappeared by a process called 'dissimilation'; then *-ēi* became *-i* by 50." No other explanation is needed for the loss of *d* than in other cases where it is intervocalic. Cf. § 116. Why not explain this case by the rule stated for intervocalic *d* in § 116?—P. 91, § 337, b. It were better, especially in scientific grammars, to discard the term "conditional" for the verbal form expressing a conclusion from a condition, replacing it by some more accurate designation of what is really a *futurum in praeterito*.—P. 129, § 396. The etymon of *ocidre* is *aucidere* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, p. 143), and not *occidere*, which would have given *oitidre*.—P.

134, § 409. *Conoistre*, not from *conoscere*, but from *conoscere* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, p. 33), also postulated by Ital. *conoscere*, Span. *conocer*.

Besides these, there are other cases in which the doctrine of Schwan-Behrens may well be revised in accordance with more recent investigation such as Meyer-Lübke's *Einführung*, the second edition of which has just appeared, and the same author's *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*. Such cases are, e. g., the development of words like *sapidus*, *nitidus*, *malehabitus* (p. 44, § 122, 2), of *sk* to *s* (§§ 136 and 147).

Apart from minor points such as the ones above mentioned, in regard to which one may hold different opinions, Professor Luquiens' book is worthy of all praise, and deserves to be welcomed not only as the first Old French grammar offered by an American to the English-speaking public, but as well fitted to fulfill the purposes for which it is intended.

H. R. LANG.

Yale University.

LOUISE DELPIT: *L'âge d'or de la littérature française*. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1909.

This book, although not a work of science, deserves a brief mention here. It will advantageously replace the Duval, upon which many schools, and even colleges, have so long depended for an elementary course in French literature. Miss Delpit has a real sense of what young people ought to be told, what will make literature interesting to them and not distasteful. She also realizes very well that a history of French literature for American schools must be written in an entirely different spirit from such a history written for French schools. Many things that can easily be taken for granted in a French milieu require careful explanation for students in a foreign country.

Does this mean that Miss Delpit's book is ideal from all points of view?—No. I can imagine a book rendered even more objective than hers. There are a few chapters where the author has forgotten what she had so well realized in others, namely, that it is best to start on the principle